

REMARKS

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,537,314 to Kanter ("*Kanter*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,640 to Postrel ("*Postrel*") and U.S. Publication No. 2003/0070080 to Rosen ("*Rosen*"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claim 9 recites a point transfer dealer system comprising, for example, "a point redemption system for receiving first data encrypted using a public key of the point redemption system from the customer, the first data comprising second data encrypted using a private key of the customer."

In the previous response, Applicant argued that *Kanter* and *Postrel* fail to disclose "first data encrypted using a public key . . . , the first data comprising second data encrypted using a private key," as recited in claim 9. See Amendment filed on October 2, 2007. The Examiner attempts to cure the deficiencies of *Kanter* and *Postrel* with *Rosen*, stating, "Rosen discloses . . . encrypted data comprising another encrypted data with in it." Office Action at 12. *Rosen*, however, does not disclose "first data encrypted using a public key . . . , the first data comprising second data encrypted using a private key," as recited in claim 9.

Rosen discloses, in Fig. 61, "encrypt message with session key" (step 376) and then "decrypt message with session key" (step 386). See similar disclosures of

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

encrypting a message once and then decrypting the message in Figs. 66, 69, 70, and 71 of *Rosen*. Because these disclosures include encrypting the message once and then decrypting the encrypted message, *Rosen* fails to disclose or suggest the claimed "[encrypted] first data . . . comprising [encrypted] second data."

Rosen further discloses, in Fig. 60, "encrypt the message" (step 322), "decrypt message" (step 328), "encrypt the message" (step 346), and "decrypt message" (step 352). See similar disclosures of encrypting a message, then decrypting the encrypted message, then encrypting again the decrypted message, and decrypting the encrypted message again in Figs. 88 and 89. Because these disclosures include encrypting, decrypting, and then encrypting the decrypted message, *Rosen* fails to disclose or suggest the claimed "[encrypted] first data . . . comprising [encrypted] second data."

Rosen further discloses, in Fig. 66, "encrypt electronic object" (step 496), "sign the encrypted [electronic object]" (step 498), "verify [encrypted electronic] object signature" (step 508), then "decrypt" (step 512). This disclosure of encrypting an object and then signing the encrypted object does not result in the claimed "[encrypted] first data . . . comprising [encrypted] second data."

Rosen further discloses, in Fig. 88, "encrypt certificate" (step 1252), "validate certificate" (step 1262), "encrypt the message" (step 1294), and then "decrypt message" (step 1296). This disclosure of encrypting a certificate and encrypting a message does not result in the claimed "[encrypted] first data . . . comprising [encrypted] second data."

For at least the reasons given above, *Rosen* fails to disclose or suggest "a point redemption system for receiving first data encrypted using a public key of the point redemption system from the customer, the first data comprising second data encrypted

using a private key of the customer." Therefore, *Rosen* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Kanter* and *Postrel*. Thus, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to claim 9. Claim 14, although different in scope from claim 9, is allowable over the cited references for at least reasons similar to those given for claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 18, 2008

By: 

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921